

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claim 18 to correct an informality in this claim. The change to claim 18 made herein does not introduce any new matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ferlitsch* (US 2002/0089692 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17-25.

Considering first independent claim 1, in support of the anticipation rejection, the Examiner asserts the *Ferlitsch* reference discloses “a notification unit that provides a notification of change in the storage location to the print job submitting device (see Fig. 15 (700, 708) and paragraphs [0113-0114]).” Office Action at page 3. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s characterization of the *Ferlitsch* reference relative to the claimed subject matter.

In Paragraph [0113], the *Ferlitsch* reference states that “[i]f all printers in the preferred group are available 688, the SDPC will direct the print tasks to the preferred group 690 and notify the user of the tasks’ destinations.” In Paragraph [0114], the *Ferlitsch* reference states that “[t]he SDPC will then direct the print tasks to this new printer group 698 and notify the user of the destination of the print tasks 700.” Thus, to be more specific, what is carried out by the configuration of *Ferlitsch* is simply that the SDPC will notify the user of the tasks’ destinations, but the configuration of *Ferlitsch* does not notify the user of a change in the storage location, as specified in the claimed subject matter.

Further, in the configuration of *Ferlitsch*, it is the “SDPC” that corresponds to the claimed “print job submitting device,” and it is the “printer” that corresponds to the claimed

“print job management system” and “print device.” In the configuration defined in the claimed subject matter, the “print job submitting device” *receives* a notification from the “print job management system,” and the “print job submitting device” does not issue a notification.

Thus, for the reasons set forth above, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose (or suggest) “a notification unit that provides a notification of change in the storage location to [the] print job submitting device,” as specified in claim 1. Consequently, for at least this reason, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every of feature of claim 1.

Independent claims 7 and 13 define systems that include “a change notification unit.” Accordingly, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 7 and 13.

Independent claim 17 defines a network that includes a print job submitting device having a communication switch unit that *receives* a notification of change from a print job management system, and switches the destination of the two-way communication to a new print device. As such, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claim 17.

Each of independent claims 18-21 defines a method that includes either providing a notification of change in the storage location to the print job submitting device or, when a notification of change is received from a print job management system, switching the destination of the two-way communication to a new print device. Thus, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claims 18-21.

Each of independent claims 22-25 defines subject matter that includes a recording medium having a computer program stored thereon, with the computer program causing a computer to implement functionality corresponding to that specified in one of claims 18-21. Thus, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claims 22-25.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17-25, as presented herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Ferlitsch*. Claims 2 and 4-6, each of which depends from claim 1, claims 8-12, each of which depends from claim 7, and claims 14-16, each of which depends from claim 13, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Ferlitsch* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ferlitsch*. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejection, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose (or suggest) a notification unit as specified in claim 1. Nothing in the *Ferlitsch* reference cures the above-discussed deficiency of this reference relative to the subject matter defined in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Ferlitsch* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-25, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection

Application No. 10/617,480
Amendment dated August 4, 2008
Response to Office Action dated May 2, 2008

with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to

Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP039).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920